



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

fear that a stronger statute would never be adopted, or perhaps would be held unconstitutional.

Other sections of the statute provide useful reforms for dealing with persons who are acquitted because of insanity.<sup>9</sup>

## RECENT CASES

ADMIRALTY — JURISDICTION OF COURT OF A NEUTRAL COUNTRY TO DECREE RESTITUTION OF PRIZE MADE IN BREACH OF THAT COUNTRY'S NEUTRALITY.

INTERNATIONAL LAW — RIGHT TO SEQUESTERATE PRIZES IN NEUTRAL PORTS — IMMUNITY OF SHIP FROM SUIT BECAUSE OF FOREIGN SOVEREIGN'S INTEREST. — The *Appam*, which had been lawfully taken as prize by a German man-of-war, was brought into Hampton Roads by a prize crew, who asked that the ship be interned until the end of the war, claiming a right of such internment under a treaty. While the Secretary of State was still considering the application for internment, the British owners filed libels in the United States District Court to recover possession of the ship and cargo. The court decreed the restitution. *The Appam*, 234 Fed. 389 (U. S. Dist. Ct., E. D., Va.).

For a discussion of this case, see NOTES, p. 161.

ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION — POWER OF A STATE COURT TO DECREE THE SALE OF A VESSEL. — Plaintiffs are the minority owners of a vessel and are dissatisfied with the employment thereof by the majority owners. An accounting, the appointment of a receiver, the sale of the vessel, and a division of the proceeds ratably amongst the part owners are sought by the plaintiffs in a State court. *Held*, that the U. S. district courts have exclusive jurisdiction to give the relief sought. *Fisher v. Carey*, 159 Pac. 577 (Cal.).

The Constitution provides that "The Judicial power [of the United States] shall extend . . . to all Cases of Admiralty and Maritime Jurisdiction." Art. III, § 2. The Judiciary Act gives to the district courts original jurisdiction in all civil admiralty cases, reserving to suitors in all cases the remedies of the common law where it is competent to afford relief. U. S. COMP. STAT. 1913, § 991 (3). Manifestly, this Act was not intended to, and no act of Congress can, detract from the jurisdiction left in the State courts by the Constitution. It is to the Constitution, therefore, that one must go to ascertain whether equitable relief, such as is desired in a suit for partition and sale, may be

<sup>9</sup> "Sec. 2. When in any indictment or information any act or omission is charged against any person as an offense, and it is given in evidence on the trial of such person for that offense that he was mentally diseased at the time when he did the act or made the omission charged, then if the jury before whom such person is tried concludes that he did the act or made the omission charged, but by reason of his mental disease was not responsible according to the preceding section, then the jury shall return a special verdict that the accused did the act or made the omission charged against him but was not at the time legally responsible, by reason of his mental disease.

Sec. 3. When such special verdict is found, the court shall remand the prisoner to the custody of [the proper officer] and shall immediately order an inquisition by [the proper persons] to determine whether the prisoner is at that time suffering from a mental disease so as to be a menace to the public safety. If the members of the inquisition find that such person is mentally diseased as aforesaid, then the judge shall order that such person be committed to the state hospital for the insane, to be confined there until he shall have so far recovered from such mental disease as to be no longer a menace to the public safety. If they find that the prisoner is not suffering from mental disease as aforesaid, then he shall be immediately discharged from custody." The two bills, and the report of the committee recommending them, may be found in 7 J. CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY, 484.